Exhibit 3

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

TQ DELTA, LLC,	
Plaintif	Ť,
٧.	C.A. No. 13-cv-1835-RGA
2WIRE, INC.,	
Defend	ant.

Jury Verdict

I. INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,836,381 (THE '381 PATENT)

1. Has TQ Delta proven by a preponderance of the evidence that 2Wire infringed corrected claim 5 of the '381 patent by making, selling, and/or offering to sell its product model nos. 5031NV, 5168NV, 5168N, and 5268AC (BCM6368/BCM63168 chipsets)?

Answer this question by checking either "Yes" or "No."

Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for 2Wire.

Yes	V	No	

II. INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,844,882 (THE '882 PATENT)

2. Has TQ Delta proven by a preponderance of the evidence that 2Wire infringed corrected claim 13 of the '882 patent by making, selling, and/or offering to sell its product model nos. 5031NV, 5168NV, 5168N, and 5268AC (BCM6368/BCM63168 chipsets)?

Answer this question by checking either "Yes" or "No."

Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for 2Wire.

Yes	/	No
1 00		110

3. Has TQ Delta proven by a preponderance of the evidence that 2Wire infringed corrected claim 13 of the '882 patent by making, selling, and/or offering to sell its product model nos. i3812V and 3801HGV (BCM6091 chipset)?

Answer this question by checking either "Yes" or "No."

Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for 2Wire.

Yes V	No

III. INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,276,048 (THE '048 PATENT)

4. Has TQ Delta proven by a preponderance of the evidence that 2Wire infringed claim 1 of the '048 patent by making, selling, and/or offering to sell its product model nos. 5031NV, 5168NV, 5168N, and 5268AC (BCM6368/BCM63168 chipsets)?

Answer this question by checking either "Yes" or "No."

Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for 2Wire.

	/		
Yes		No	

5. Has TQ Delta proven by a preponderance of the evidence that 2Wire infringed claim 1 of the '048 patent by making, selling, and/or offering to sell its product model nos. i3812V and 3801HGV (BCM6091 chipset)?

Answer this question by checking either "Yes" or "No."

Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for 2Wire.

Yes	\	No
	_	

IV. OBVIOUSNESS

- 6. Has 2Wire proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim 5 of the '381 patent is invalid as obvious in view of:
 - a. The disclosure of LB-031 as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art?

Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for 2Wire. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta.



The disclosure of LB-031 in combination with the disclosure of Mazzoni?

b.

		Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for 2Wire. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta. Yes No
7.		Wire proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim 13 of the '882 is invalid as obvious in view of:
	a.	The disclosure of LB-031 as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art?
		Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for 2Wire. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta. Yes No
	b.	The disclosure of LB-031 in combination with the disclosure of Mazzonia
	0.	Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for 2Wire. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta. Yes No
8.		Wire proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim 1 of the '048 is invalid as obvious in view of?
	a.	The disclosure of LB-031 as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art?
		Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for 2Wire. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta.
		Yes No
		4

	b.	The disclosure of LB-031 in combination with the disclosure of Mazzoni?		
		Checking "Yes" below indicates a finding for 2Wire. Checking "No" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta.		
		Yes No		
VALI	DITY (OF THE CERTIFICATES OF CORRECTION		
9.	the '38	as 2Wire proven by clear and convincing evidence that the error in claim 5 of the '381 patent was not clearly evident to a person of ordinary skill in the art, or that the correction of that error would not have been clearly evident to a person of the correction of that error would not have been clearly evident to a person of the correction of the art?		
	Checki	ing "Yes" below indicates a finding for 2Wire. ing "No" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta. No		
10.	the '88	Wire proven by clear and convincing evidence that the error in claim 13 of 2 patent was not clearly evident to a person of ordinary skill in the art, or e correction of that error would not have been clearly evident to a person of y skill in the art?		
		ng "Yes" below indicates a finding for 2Wire. ng "No" below indicates a finding for TQ Delta.		
	Yes	No 🗸		

V.